

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/031,186	06/03/2002	Dieter Dohring	TURKP0119US	2547
7590 08/12/2004		EXAMINER		
Don W Bulson			STERLING, AMY JO	
Renner Otto Boisselle & Sklar 19th Floor			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1621 Euclid Avenue			3632	
Cleveland, OH 44115			DATE MAILED: 08/12/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

/
V

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action	10/031,186	DOHRING ET AL.			
, . 	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Amy J. Sterling	3632			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
THE REPLY FILED 30 July 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THI Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a inal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applica) a timely filed amendment whicl	ation. A proper reply to a high places the application in			
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.					
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	later than SIX MONTHS from the mailin	g date of the final rejection.			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The ee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of 2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offi imely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	of extension and the corresponding amo the shortened statutory period for reply ce later than three months after the mai	ount of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or			
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.					
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:				
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);					
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);					
(c) ⊠ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or					
(d) they present additional claims without cancel	ing a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claims.			
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .					
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	tion(s):				
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed amendment			
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because:		idered but does NOT place the			
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bed raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were newly			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we					
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		•			
Claim(s) allowed:					
Claim(s) objected to:					
Claim(s) rejected:					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on is a) ☐ app	roved or b) disapproved by t	he Examiner.			
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	·			
10. Other:	A Mak				

PRIMARY EXAMINER

AJS 8/5/04

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303)

Continuation of 2. NOTE: The combination of claims does not simplify the appeal issues, The arguments presented that the dimensions are significant are unpersuasive, the dimensions being held as an optimum design choice. The argument presented for novelty using viny acetate and the method for making is unpersuasive in that any suitable material or suitable method of making is also a design choice which may be optimized and still be considered routine in the art.